REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were pending prior to this amendment. Claims 1-24 stand rejected. Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 12-24 have been amended. Claims 5-6 and 11 have been cancelled. New claims 25-29 have been added. At least in light of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 12 has been amended according to the present specification, paragraph 37. Claim 6 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-9, 17-19 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-9, 17-19 and 20-23 have been amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,991,292 (Focsaneanu, et al.), and in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0205359 (Matsuhira).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of sending signals from the first gateway to a source endpoint when the phone number included in the request matches one of the entries in the local dial plan, the signals directing the source endpoint to encrypt media packets for the requested call using a protocol for encrypting real-time media, which is shown at least in FIG. 2. None of the references teach this and other features included in claim 1. Thus, claims 1-3 should be allowed.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,137,869 (Voit, et al.) and in view of Matsuhira.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of sending signals from the first gateway to a source endpoint when the phone number included in the request matches one of the entries in the local dial plan, the signals directing the source endpoint to encrypt media packets for the requested call using a protocol for encrypting real-time media, which is shown at least in FIG. 2. None of the references teach this and other features included in claim 1. Thus, claims 1-3 should be allowed. Claim 5 has been cancelled.

Claim 17 has been amended to include a feature described in paragraph 24 and other portions of the present specification. None of the references teach at least the features of transferring the encrypted media packets over an Internet Protocol (IP) connection that traverses the circuit switched network and extending between the first and second gateways when the second gateway includes the capability for end-to-end secure real-time transport; and converting the received encrypted media packet from an IP format to a Publicly Switched Telephone Network format for transmission across a data link that traverses the circuit switched network when the second gateway does not include the capability for end-to-end secure real-time transport. Thus, claim 17 should be allowed.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edgett and Matsuhira as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0021415 (Torvinen).

Claim 4 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit and Matsuhira as applied above, and further in view of Torvinen.

Claim 4 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit as applied above and in view of Edgett.

Claim 10 has been amended for clarification. Claim 10 includes the feature of a processor configured to establish an Internet Protocol (IP) link for transferring encrypted IP packet payloads over a circuit switched network, the IP link extending between the network processing device and a remote gateway that is located between the circuit switched network and a packet switched network, the connection extending over the circuit switched network. None of the cited references teach at least this feature.

For example, Edgett teaches a network access device (205) encrypting a password with a public key. *See* Edgett, FIG. 2. The encrypted password is transferred over the PSTN 250 using a conventional protocol for circuit switched network transmission (not an IP link), through the modem pool 215, to the network access server 220. The network access server 220 forwards the encrypted password to the network decryption server 240, which decrypts the password using a private key. After decryption, the server 240 accesses the password,

and when valid, signals that the device 205 may begin sending media or other information to and from the internet 260 using the ISP network 255.

In contrast, claim 10 includes the feature of a processor configured to establish an Internet Protocol (IP) link for transferring encrypted IP packet payloads over a circuit switched network and extending across the circuit switched network, the IP link extending between the network processing device and a remote gateway that is located between the circuit switched network and a packet switched network. None of the cited references teach at least this feature. Thus, claims 10 and 11 should be allowed.

Claims 6, 7 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit and Matsuhira as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,392,357 (Bulfer, et al.).

Claims 7 and 18 are dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 17. Claim 6 has been cancelled.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Voit and Matsuhira.

Claim 8 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit and Matsuhira as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0019801 (Lindholm).

Claim 9 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit in view of Bulfer as applied above, and further in view of *Applied Cryptography* (2nd Edition) (hereinafter "Schneier").

Claim 19 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 17.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Focsaneanu as applied above, and in view of Edgett.

Claims 10 and 11 should be allowed for at least the reasons previously stated above.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Focsaneanu and Matsuhira as applied above, and further in view of Lindholm.

Claim 9 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Focsaneanu and in view of Edgett as applied above, and further in view of obviousness over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0125357 (Saadat, et al.).

Claim 12 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Focsaneanu and in view of Edgett as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,948 (Bowman-Amuah).

Claim 13 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Focsaneanu and in view of Edgett as applied above, and further in view of Schneier.

Claim 14 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Focsaneanu and in view of Edgett and Schneier, and further in view of being obvious over Bulfer.

Claim 15 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Focsaneanu and in view of Edgett as applied above, and further in view of Lindholm, et al.

Claim 16 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,110,391 (Rogers, et al.), and in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0038628 (Ofek, et al.).

Claim 20 has been amended and should be allowed for at least similar reasons as claim 17. Claims 21-22 are dependent and should also be allowed.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Rogers, et al., and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,238 (Hluchyj).

Claim 23 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Rogers, et al. and Hluchyj as applied above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0068481 (Seshadri, et al.) and further in view of Bulfer.

Claim 24 is dependent and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

New Claims

New claims 25-29 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in at least FIGS. 1 and 2.

January 31, 2007 Telephone Interview

An after final telephone interview was conducted between Examiner Jason Gee and Attorney Michael Cofield on January 31, 2007 to discuss the continued rejection to original claims 10 and 11. During the interview, Applicant indicated that none of the cited reference teach at least a processor forwarding packets having an encrypted IP packet payload over an IP link established over the circuit switched network without decrypting the encrypted IP packet payload when transferred between the IP network and circuit switched network.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 503-222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Michael A. Cofield
Reg. No. 54,630

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575